R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 699 24

AN EVALUATION OF THE 1964 SUMMER INSTITUTES ON TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE.

BY- HARRIS, DAVID P.
GEORGETOWN UNIV., WASHINGTON, D.C.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-157 PUB DATE 65
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.72 43P.

DESCRIPTORS- LANGUAGES, *ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, SPANISH, *QUESTIONNAIRES, *INSTITUTE TYPE COURSES, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, ATTITUDES, CHANGING ATTITUDES, TEACHING METHODS, *TEACHING TECHNIQUES, CALIFORNIA, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, PUERTO RICO, LOS ANGELES

THE NDEA ENGLISH INSTITUTES HELD IN PUERTO RICO AND AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES IN 1964 WERE ANALYZED BY USING A FOLLOWUP QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO ALL INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS. THE PURPOSES OF THE FOLLOWUP QUESTIONNAIRE WERE TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT TO WHICH (1) THE PARTICIPANTS HAD BEEN ABLE TO USE THE PRINCIPLES AND TECHNIQUES TAUGHT IN THE INSTITUTE PROGRAMS AND (2) THE PARTICIPANTS' EARLY JUDGMENTS ABOUT THE INSTITUTES HAD CHANGED AS A RESULT OF THEIR SUBSEQUENT EXPERIENCE IN THE CLASSROOM. GENERALLY, JUDGMENTS ABOUT THE INSTITUTE DID NOT CHANGE IN THAT PARTICIPANTS FELT THAT IT WAS WORTHWHILE. OVER ONE-HALF OF THE PARTICIPANTS HAD ALREADY FOUND OPPORTUNITIES TO SHARE THEIR NEW KNOWLEDGE WITH OTHERS THROUGH SPEECHES OR CONSULTATION. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE INSTITUTES WERE DEVELOPED FROM REPORTS OF EVALUATORS, CONSULTANTS, AND PARTICIPANTS. (LP)

ED003699

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

AN EVALUATION OF THE 1964 SUMMER INSTITUTES ON TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Cooperative Research Project Number S-157

David P. Harris
Georgetown University

1964-65

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FINAL REPORT ON THE 1964 NDEA ENGLISH INSTITUTES

David P. Harris

In September 1964 the three evaluators of the 1964 NDEA English institutes, Sirarpi Ohannessian, William Slager, and David P. Harris (director), submitted a "Preliminary Evaluation Report on the 1964 NDEA English Institutes," which included their (1) General Evaluation of the 1964 Institutes, (2) Suggestions for Additional Conference Sites, and (3) Recommendations for Future English Institutes. (The "Preliminary Report" appears as Appendix I to this report.) The evaluators' recommendations were included in the preliminary, rather than the final, report in order to make their observations available to the directors of the 1965 institutes at the time they were planning the new programs. Therefore, the present report will be concerned chiefly with an analysis of the Follow-up Questionnaire sent to all institute participants in December 1964. Frequent reference to, and comparison with, the First Questionnaire, completed by the participants during the last week of the institutes, will also be made. (A full summary of the First Questionnaire appears as Appendix II to this report; a similar summary of the Follow-up Questionnaire is given as Appendix III.)

Nature of the Two Questionnaires

As mentioned above, two questionnaires to participants were included in the evaluation procedure. The first of these, distributed to all participants at the conclusion of the institutes, included questions about the participants' background and training and asked for judgments about the effectiveness of the

institute programs. Responses to this questionnaire proved of great value to the evaluators in the preparation of the "Preliminary Report."

The Follow-up Questionnaire was prepared by the three evaluators during meetings held in Washington on September 15-16, 1964, and was sent to all participants in December 1964. Duplicate copies, with covering notes, were subsequently sent to participants who did not respond to the first mailing.

The purposes of the Follow-up Questionnaire were (1) to determine the extent to which the participants' early judgments about the institutes had changed as a result of their subsequent experience in the classroom; and (2) to determine the extent to which the participants had been able to make use of the principles and techniques taught in the institute programs.

Brief Summary of Results of the Follow-up Questionnaire

Questionnaires were completed and returned by 79 percent of the participants in the two institutes:

Institute	No. of Returned Questionnaires	Total No. of Participants
UCLA	46	55
Puerto Rico	39	53

Responses to the 8 questionnaire items may be briefly summarized as follows.

1. Value of Institute Activities. In the First Questionnaire, participants were asked to rate the probable value to them of the various institute activities: linguistics, methodology, demonstration classes, anthropology, Spanish (or English),

Rating was to be done on a 5-point scale in which 5 = should be very useful, 4 = should be rather useful, 3 = should be of some use, 2 = probably will not be of much use, 1 = will not be of any use. This item was replicated in the Follow-up Questionnaire, though here the participants were asked to indicate, on the same scale, how useful they "are now finding" what they learned in the several institute classes.

No striking changes in the means of the ratings occurred: means in the Follow-up Questionnaire were all within .4 of a rating point of the means recorded for the First Questionnaire. All means on the follow-up survey were above 3.00 ("of some use") except for the UCLA participants' rating of Practice Teaching (not included in the First Questionnaire), where the mean was only 2.68.

It is perhaps of interest that the UCLA participants registered far fewer ratings of 1 and 2 (the lowest ratings) in the Follow-up Questionnaire than they had done in the First Questionnaire, while, conversely, the Puerto Rican teachers, whose ratings on both questionnaires generally ran quite high, tended to give fewer 5 ratings ("very useful") on the follow-up survey.

2. Class Changes Made as a Result of Institute Experience.
A gratifying number of participants reported making changes in their classroom materials and methods as a result of their institute training:

	% Reporting Changes
Changes in teaching materials:	43
Changes in classroom techniques:	88
Increase in time devoted to non-English speakers:[1]	11
Changes in methods of grouping students:	24

3. Regulations or Restrictions Preventing Additional Changes.

The evaluators felt that it would be useful to determine whether any local regulations or restrictions would prevent the respondents from introducing changes in their teaching methods and materials.

Two-thirds of the respondents indicated that there were no such regulations or restrictions. Of the explanations offered by respondents who indicated that there were restrictions, the most common were (1) budgetary limitations; (2) restrictions on texts used in English programs; (3) inadequate time allotment for instruction.

4. Opportunities for Participants to Disseminate Information Acquired in the Institutes.

Item 4 of the questionnaire asked respondents whether they "have been asked to speak about what you learned at the institute or to act as a consultant in any ESL or related activities." Almost 60 percent of the respondents indicated that they had had such opportunities.

5. Current Expansion of ESL Activities in the Participants' Schools or School Districts.

Forty-four percent of the respondents reported that local English as a second language activities were being expanded.

[1]Unfortunately, the question asking about changes in the

Twenty-nine respondents indicated that such expansion was directly or indirectly the result of their attendance at the institute.

6. Suggestions for Lightening the Institute Schedule.

As indicated in the "Preliminary Report," it was the rather general consensus that the 1964 institute programs tended to be somewhat too full, allowing too little leisure and study time. In their Follow-up Questionnaire, therefore, the evaluators asked for specific suggestions for lightening the program. The responses to this item showed that a large proportion of the participants retained the feeling that their days at the institute had been kept too full. By far the most common suggestion (offered by 28 respondents) was to eliminate or at least reduce the number of after-class lectures. Other suggestions were to reduce the time devoted to various institute subjects: linguistics (10 respondents), demonstration classes (13), anthropology (8), and methods (3). In addition, 7 participants in the Puerto Rican program recommended elimination of Saturday classes (which were held during the first part of the Puerto Rican institute).

7. Suggestions for Adding New Activities or Giving Greater Emphasis to Old Ones.

The suggestions offered by participants in the UCLA program were so different from those given by the Puerto Rican participants that they must be considered separately.

---

time devoted to non-English speakers was apparently misinterpreted by almost half the respondents as asking how much time was spent on these students. Thus the figure on the percent of those reporting changes may be spuriously low.

A. UCLA Responses. The chief general suggestion was for more emphasis to be given to "practical applications." Both the linguistics and anthropology courses were mentioned specifically as needing the "practical approach." Several respondents also asked for an elementary course or section in linguistics. And, predictably, a number of participants asked for more time to prepare their lessons.

B. Puerto Rican Responses. Perhaps the chief suggestion from both the participants from the Mainland and those who taught in Puerto Rican schools was for more language study (English for the Puerto Ricans, Spanish for the Mainlanders). Many of the Mainland teachers asked for more contact with Puerto Ricans. And many of the Puerto Ricans recommended more emphasis on methodology.

8. General Value of the Institute.

As the concluding question, respondents were asked whether they would recommend such institutes to others. Ninety-three percent replied that they would, although 7% of these gave qualified responses.

Conclusions

Results of the Follow-up Questionnaire tend to reinforce a number of the earlier conclusions of the evaluators, reached after observation of institute classes, discussions with participants and staff members, and the analysis of responses to the First Questionnaire.

Responses to items 1 and 8 indicate that the participants in general continue to feel that the institute program was worthwhile in its purposes and effective in its presentation. Many of the participants have already put their institute learnings to good use by effecting appropriate changes in their classroom materials and techniques (cf. items 2 and 5), and it is probable that even more of them would have made such changes if they had not been prevented by certain local conditions and regulations (cf. item 3). Over half of the participants have already found opportunities to share their new knowledge with others, through speeches or consultation (cf. item 4).

Likewise, a number of the evaluators' earlier recommendations are echoed in the results of the Follow-up Questionnaire (cf. items 6 and 7). These include: (1) lightening somewhat the general program, as by reducing the number of after-class lectures, and perhaps by reducing the hours devoted to anthropology, practice teaching and observation;[2] and (2) emphasizing the practical applications of the institute studies, particularly as regards the instruction in linguistics.

---

[2]This is not to suggest that practice teaching and observation should be deemphasized. The evaluators did question, however, whether it was pedagogically necessary or even sound for such activities to be held "every single day." (Cf. Section II C of the "Preliminary Report.")

PRELIMINARY EVALUATION REPORT ON THE 1964 NDEA ENGLISH INSTITUTES

David P. Harris

Both of the 1964 English institutes, at the University of Puerto Rico and the University of California at Los Angeles, were visited for three days by each of the three evaluators, Sirarpi Ohannessian, William Slager, and David P. Harris. These visitations were so scheduled that the institutes were observed at the beginning, in the middle, and toward the conclusion of the program.

Following these visitations, a two-day evaluation meeting was held in Washington, D.C., September 15-16, 1964. The session on September 15, held in the Office of Education, was attended by the three evaluators and by the following consultants and personnel from the Office of Education: John Fisher, Edward Anthony, Harold Allen, James Squire, D. Lee Hamilton, James M. Spillane, Loretta Wawrzyniak, James Alatis, Donald R. Tuttle, Arno Jewett, Doris V. Gunderson.

At this general session the evaluators' reports were discussed, a series of recommendations were proposed, and the content of a follow-up questionnaire to institute participants was developed in outline. On September 16 the three evaluators met by themselves at the Center for Applied Linguistics to continue with the preparation of the proposals and questionnaire. The following recommendations resulted from this two-day meeting.

General Evaluation of the 1964 Institutes

1. University of California at Los Angeles. The Evaluation Committee believes that the University of California at Los Angeles was an excellent site for one of the first English institutes. By its location it was able to serve the needs of many communities whose schools include non-English-speaking students, particularly those with Spanish or Indian languages as their background, or first, languages. The staff and facilities at U.C.L.A. were excellent; the program was well conceived and executed.

If there was any problem at the U.C.L.A. institute, it was the result of the very richness of the offerings: quite obviously a large proportion of the participants felt the need for somewhat more leisure and study time, particularly toward the close of the program. Last year's "Summary of Evaluations" of the 1963 National Defense Language Institutes recommended that institute directors be permitted a reasonable amount of flexibility in adjusting their programs to meet certain needs and contingencies that arise as the programs proceed. As will be seen later in this report, the 1964 English institute evaluators urge the same sort of flexibility. By recognizing and taking steps to alleviate "participant fatigue," the University of California at Los Angeles should be able in the future even to surpass the excellence of its 1964 program, and the Evaluation Committee certainly would endorse the holding of a second English institute at this University.

2. University of Puerto Rico. The Evaluation Committee also approves the choice of the University of Puerto Rico as the site of one of the pioneer English institutes. Puerto Rico is obviously a crucial area for the teaching of English as a second language, and nothing would seem more desirable and appropriate than for the ND English institute program to try to meet the vital language needs of this island. Moreover, Puerto Rico is a very logical place for Continental teachers of Spanish-speaking children to gain greater insights into the linguistic and cultural problems of these students. The Committee is confident that both the Puerto Rican and Continental participant groups gained much from their experiences in this institute, which was administered in a most professional fashion.

At the same time, it is suggested that the opportunities for fruitful interaction of the two groups might even be improved if steps were taken to match, insofar as possible, the two groups in terms of academic training and professional experience. Also, it would seem particularly necessary, in a location such as this, to "import" a sufficient number of staff members to ensure that a wide variety of methods and materials are presented to the participants. Perhaps it might even be found feasible to appoint a Mainlander as an Associate or Assistant Director of such an institute. With the effecting of these changes, the Committee would certainly endorse the holding of a second English institute at the University of Puerto Rico.

Suggestions for Additional Institute Sites

If it is found possible and advisable to expand the number of ND English institutes, the Committee would suggest consideration of the following as possible general locations: Florida, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and New York. In each of these areas there are quite significant groups of non-English-speaking students whose teachers could surely profit from the excellent ESL training provided by these institutes, and from whose numbers the very valuable observation/practice classes might be formed.

Recommendations for Future English Institutes

The following recommendations have emerged from the reports of the evaluators, the discussions with the consultants, and the questionnaire responses of the participants. It is the hope and intention of the Evaluation Committee that they be taken as guidelines for future English institutes. Although obviously based directly on the experiences of the 1964 institutes, they most certainly are not intended as criticism of these institutes, for in many instances the recommendations are simply the passing on of procedures which the evaluators thought had been effectively developed in one or both of this year's programs, and in other cases they represent improvements which the directors of the 1964 institutes themselves proposed.

1. Dissemination of Publicity Materials. To ensure that each institute will have a sufficient number of applicants from whom to choose, it is essential for the institutes and the appropriate Government offices to cooperate in achieving the widest possible dissemination of materials publicizing the institutes. Such publicity should certainly include announcements in the various educational and English journals.

2. Information to Applicants. Materials sent to each applicant should include "a clear and detailed description of the program (objectives, courses, intensity, hourly schedule) so that the applicant will be aware of the opportunities and the effort that the institute will offer and demand."*

3. Coordination of Activities. To the greatest extent possible, the activities in the various institute classes should reinforce each other. To achieve and maintain

---

* Quoted sections in these recommendations are taken from "A Summary of Evaluations" of the 1963 Defense Language Institutes, by Donald D. Walsh. They were chosen by the 1964 Evaluation Committee for their particular relevance to the English institutes.

such coordination, staff members should visit one another's classes periodically throughout the institute. "When they are hired, staff members should be told that coordination to this high degree is an essential part of their job." In addition, the director should schedule regular staff meetings at which the teachers may have an opportunity to exchange information about their class activities and to alert one another to incipient problems.

4. Program Flexibility. "One of the most desirable qualities in an institute is flexibility, a readiness to adjust the program in the light of the first week's experience" or occasionally to lighten the daily schedule if, toward the end, it is obvious that "participant fatigue" is reducing the effectiveness of the program.

5. "General Assemblies." It is recommended that at least one hour per week be devoted to a general assembly of both staff and student body. The first of these sessions should include a careful statement of the specific goals and purposes of the institute. Later sessions should provide some means for the participants to ask questions and offer suggestions concerning the content and emphases of the program and the procedures by which these goals are being sought. (Such student participation might be handled through a small student committee chosen by, and representing, the entire participant group.)

6. Testing. While tests are certainly a legitimate and appropriate means of measuring student progress and attainment in these institutes, care must be taken to see that the time and attention devoted to testing are kept within reasonable bounds. In view of the highly selective nature of the participant groups, it would scarcely seem appropriate to give undue emphasis to final grades or to use low marks on "progress tests" for their shock effect. A policy of moderation with regard to testing should be made very clear to the staff by the director during the institute planning sessions.

7. Library and Other Resource Materials. If one goal of the institutes is to prepare participants to function effectively as leaders in TEFL programs in their own schools and school systems, then every effort should be made to introduce them to a wide variety of books and journals in linguistics, applied linguistics, and methodology. In addition, it is essential that a number of current textbooks aimed at the primary and secondary levels and representing a variety of approaches be made available.

Prior to the institute the director should make arrangements with the university to ensure the availability of these reading materials during evenings and week-ends. In view of the heavy morning and afternoon schedules of the institutes, it is unrealistic to expect participants to be able to do the necessary reading during the daytime or on their five working days.

8. Evening Activities. It would seem clear from this year's experience that no more than one evening per week should be taken up with lectures or other institute activities at which attendance is required.

9. Linguistics Class.

   A. In view of the varied backgrounds of the institute participants, there should be sectioning in the linguistics class on the basis of participants' prior experience and training in this field.

   B. One hour each week (preferably Monday or Friday) should be devoted to a discussion of the pertinence of the previous week's instruction to the practical problems of the classroom.

10. Methodology Class.

   A. Methodological instruction should include attention to the problems of teaching reading and writing.

10. B. It is highly important that a wide variety of materials be discussed and examined -- not simply those produced by one linguistic "school" or used in one educational system.

11. Demonstration Class and Practice Teaching.

A. It is inadvisable for the methodology teacher(s) also to conduct the demonstration classes.

B. The demonstration teachers should be selected from among those actively engaged in teaching on the elementary and secondary levels.

C. Although the classes used for demonstration purposes should meet throughout the institute period, these classes need not, and indeed, should not, be observed every single day. It is enough if they are observed only periodically -- as new types of techniques or materials are introduced.

D. All participants should be given the opportunity to practice-teach.

E. All observations should be followed by discussion of the techniques observed.

12. Anthropology Class. While the desirability of some instruction in anthropology would seem incontrovertible, it is altogether possible that the time devoted to the subject in the 1964 institutes (five hours each week of the institute) was somewhat more than was really needed in terms of the overall goals of the program. It is therefore suggested that consideration be given to the advisability of shortening the anthropology course, either by reducing the number of class meetings per week or by concentrating the instruction in this subject within the first half of the institute.

13. Language Classes (Instruction in Spanish or English). In view of the importance of coordinating and reinforcing the various activities of the institute, it is highly desirable for teachers of the language classes to follow the same methods, and utilize the same general techniques, as are taught in the methodology classes. Thus, for example, in selecting his language teachers, the director should choose only those with a good working knowledge of modern linguistic techniques, and the teachers should be required to visit the methodology classes with some regularity.

ANALYSIS OF RETURNS FROM THE FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTICIPANTS IN THE NDEA ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTES 1964

David P. Harris

U.C.L.A. INSTITUTE

Responses received from 55 participants.

PART I

3. Present position:

Teachers		41
Administrators		
Principals	7	
Language Coordinators	5	
Educational Specialist	1	
Director of Instruction	1	
		14

4. Native Language:

English	39
Spanish	8
Spanish/English Bilinguals	6
Dutch and Indonesian	1
[No response	1]

5. Highest degree earned, with year:

	English	Education	English-Education	Foreign Languages	Others
Bachelor's	3	9	1	2	10*
Master's	3	20		2	3
Ph.D.		1			1
1960-4	12				
1955-9	20				
1950-4	14				
1945-9	5				
1940-9	0				
1935-9	2				
1930-4	2				

*Includes one unspecified major.

6. Foreign language(s) studied, and number of years:

The typical participant had studied one language, Spanish or French, for 2-3 years.

No. of Languages	No. of Participants
0	2
1	30
2	10
3	4
4	4
5 or more	3
[Responses unclear:	2]

Total No. of Years	No. of Participants
0	2
1	4
2	13
3	2
4	7
5	8
6 or more	14
[Responses unclear:	7]

Chief Languages Named	No. of Participants
Spanish	37
French	21
German	13
Latin	8
Russian, Italian, Portuguese	3 each

7. Prior academic training in the teaching of English to non-English speakers:

Yes: 17 [Workshops and university courses being the most common types named]

No: 38

PART II

1. Number of years of teaching, indicating level(s):

Levels*	No. of Participants
Elementary only	23
Elementary and secondary	11
Secondary only	11
Secondary and college/Univ.	5
Elementary, secondary, and college/Univ.	4
Elementary and college/Univ.	1

No. of Years	No. of Participants
25-29	3
20-24	9
15-19	6
10-14	8
5-9	22
0-4	7

2. Levels of instruction in English to non-English-speaking students during the past three years:

Levels**	No. of Participants
K or 1 - 6	21
7 - 12	14
7 - U	2
U	1
A	2

[The remaining 15 participants either did not respond or indicated that the question did not apply because they were administrators rather than teachers.]

---

*These categories have been somewhat simplified.

**The symbol K = Kindergarten; U = college-university; A = Adults.

3. Situation in which English was taught to non-English-speaking students during the past three years:

Situation	No. of Participants
Classes had some non-English speakers	13
Classes had only non-English speakers	20
One or more non-English speakers were tutored	1
[No response, or indication that the question did not apply because participants were administrators]	[13]
[Unclear responses*]	[8]

4. Was one foreign language dominant among the non-English-speaking students during the past year?

Dominant Language	No. of Participants
Spanish	40
Indian languages	7
Samoan	1
None	7

5. Number of classes containing non-English-speaking students last year, and total size of each such class:

Responses to this item varied so greatly that meaningful generalizations are most difficult. Teachers reported having from 1 to 7 classes containing non-English speakers, though instances of more than 5 were quite rare. The "average" class size was about 25. When classes contained a mixture of those students who spoke English natively and those for whom it was a second language, the proportions were, on the "average," about 50-50.

6. Number of hours per week each such class met:

Five hours was by far the most common response.

---

*In questions 2 and 3, a large number of respondents failed to note that only "the past three years" were to be covered. They therefore summarized their entire teaching careers, making interpretation of the responses impossible.

7. Length in months of 1963-4 class(es) containing non-English-speaking students:

Almost all the participants who answered this question indicated 9-10 months.

8. Amount of class time allotted to exclusive instruction of the non-English speakers:

Hours	No. of Participants
0	5
less than 1	6
1-2	7
3 or more	7
[No response:	30]

9. Use of texts designed particularly for non-English-speaking students:

Twenty-eight participants indicated titles, some 30 being listed, though not all were really designed for non-English-speaking students. The following titles appeared at least two times:

Titles	No. of Participants
Fries-Rojas, "American English Series"	10
Dixson, "English Conversation"	3
Dixson, "Beginning Exercises in English"	2
"Reader's Digest Weekly Readers"	2
Wright, "Practice Your English"	2
Hayden-Pilgrim, "Mastering American English"	2
NCTE Series, "English for Today"	2

Eight participants reported using their own materials.

PART III

1. Probable value of the Institute activities (using the scale 5: should be very useful; 4: should be rather useful; 3: should be of some use; 2: probably will not be of much use; 1: probably will not be of any use):

	Ratings						
Activities	5	4	3	2	1	Omit	Mean
Linguistics	26	6	14	6	1	2	3.94
Methodology	28	16	6	4	0	1	4.26
Demonstration	13	13	14	8	6	1	3.35
Anthropology	9	9	14	14	6	3	3.02
Spanish	16	11	13	7	3	5	3.60

2. Evaluation of various aspects of the Institute (using the scale 5: excellent; 4: good; 3: satisfactory; 2: only fair; 1: unsatisfactory):

	Ratings						
Aspects	5	4	3	2	1	Omit	Mean
Scheduling of Activities	3	5	6	17	22	2	2.06
Integration of Activities	5	10	14	16	8	2	2.77
Level of Instruction	7	9	8	15	12	4	2.69
Planning	5	8	12	18	9	3	2.65

3. Criticisms of the 1964 Institute and suggestions for future Institutes:

All but two of the participants offered criticisms and recommendations. In compiling the following list, we have arbitrarily included all suggestions and comments made by at least four participants.

1) The schedule was too full, allowing too little leisure and study time. 32

2) There was too much emphasis on tests and grading. 23

3) Students should be grouped by prior training - particularly in linguistics. 17

4) The evening lectures should be worked into the day's activities and/or reduced in number. 15

5) Instruction should have been less theoretical - particularly in linguistics. 14

6) Homework and reading assignments were too heavy. 11

7) There should have been a clearer definition of the purpose and objectives of the Institute, and these should have been made known to the Participants at the outset of the program. 10

8) There should have been provision for more participation by the Institute Participants, in order to take advantage of their practical experience. 8

9) A more effective anthropology course should be offered. 7

10) Less time should be devoted to anthropology - perhaps a short series of lectures only. 7

11) There should have been greater coordination between the linguistics course and the demonstration/methods classes. 6

12) The demonstration sessions should be shorter. 6

13) There should have been greater general integration and coordination of activities. 5

14) More of the staff should have had direct experience with teaching on the pre-university levels. 4

PUERTO RICAN INSTITUTE

I. Puerto Rican Teachers

Responses received from 26 (out of 27).

PART I

3. Present position:

23 reported being English teachers; 1 said he had not yet been appointed to any school; 2 left the item blank.

4. Native Language:

All 26 indicated Spanish.

5. Highest degree earned, with year:

Bachelor's	8	[Years ranged from 1952 to 1963]
Normal Certificate	12	[Years ranged from 1949 to 1962]
[No response	6]	

(Six of the holders of the B.A. indicated that they had majored in education.)

6. Foreign language studied, and number of years:

24 gave English; 2 made no response. English had been studied for an average of 14 years.

7. Prior academic training in the teaching of English to non-English speakers:

Yes:	14	[10 described this training as "English courses"]
No:	9	
[No response	3]	

PART II

1. Number of years of teaching, indicating level(s):

Levels	No. of Participants
Elementary only	15
Elementary and secondary	10
Secondary only	1

The average number of years: 6-7.

2. Levels of instruction in English to non-English-speaking students during the past three years:

Levels:	No. of Participants
1 - 3	5
1 - 6	1
1 - 9	2
4 - 6	8
4 - 9	3
4 - 12	1
7 - 9	4
[No response:	2]

3. Situation in which English was taught to non-English-speaking students during the past three years:

23 participants indicated that all of their classes were made up entirely of non-English-speaking students. Two respondents indicated that some of their classes contained English-speaking students also; one respondent also indicated that he had done some tutoring.

4. Was one foreign language dominant among the non-English-speaking students during the past year?

Spanish would have been the logical response, but apparently the respondents did not understand the question, for only 5 gave this answer. Eleven answered "no," and there were 7 blanks. English was indicated by 3.

5. Number of classes containing non-English-speaking students last year, and total size of each such class:

The number of classes ranged from 1 to 6, with an "average" of 3-4. The "average" number of students per class was 38.

6. Number of hours per week each such class met:

Range: 2 1/2 - 10 hours

Average: 5

7. Length in months of 1963-4 class(es) containing non-English-speaking students: the 15 respondents answering this item all indicated 10 months.

8. Amount of class time allotted to exclusive instruction of the non-English speakers:

The question was not relevant, inasmuch as almost all of these classes consisted entirely of non-English-speaking students.

9. Use of texts designed particularly for non-English-speaking students:

17 participants listed the "Fries American English Series," and 6 listed "Fun, Fancy, and Adventure - a basic reader of the Puerto Rican Department of Education."

PART III*

1. Probable value of the Institute activities (using the scale 5: should be very useful; 4: should be rather useful; 3: should be of some use; 2: probably will not be of much use; 1: probably will not be of any use):

Activities	Average Rating
Linguistics	4.3
Methodology	4.9
Demonstration	4.8
Anthropology	4.4
English	5.0

*It is regretted that the Institute distributed the questionnaires before the visiting evaluator could give instructions to

2. Evaluation of various aspects of the Institute (using the scale 5: excellent; 4: good; 3: satisfactory; 2: only fair; 1: unsatisfactory):

Aspects	Average of Ratings:
Scheduling of Activities	3.8
Integration of Activities	4.3
Level of Instruction	4.2
Planning	4.6

3. Criticisms of the 1964 Institute and suggestions for future institutes:

Twelve respondents suggested changes. These tended to be quite varied, and in the following summary similar or related ideas have been combined. Where more than 1 participant made the same suggestion, the exact numbers are given in brackets.

1) Fewer class hours with more free time [9]

2) Shorter homework assignments [3]

3) There should be more social activities (with Puerto Ricans and Mainlanders together) [3]

4) More time should be devoted to the methods class [2]

5) There should be fewer lectures

6) More time should be devoted to daily-lesson planning

7) There should be more classes with the Mainlanders

8) The institutes should be longer

9) There should be no Saturday classes

10) The institutes should begin earlier in the summer

11) Meals should be free

12) There should be classes in "conversational English, literature, sociology, etc."

---

the participants. Questionnaires were returned to the Institute office (not in sealed envelopes, as was done at U.C.L.A.). It is quite possible, therefore, that participants were hesitant about being very critical of Institute policies.

13) There should be more flexibility

14) Participants should have "freedom to choose the place to sleep and to get meals"

15) "Superintendents should be broadly informed about the importance of the institutes"

II. Mainland Teachers

Responses received from 26 participants.

PART I

3. Present position:

Teachers 18

Administrators

Exec. Assist. to Superint.	1
Chairman of English Dept.	1
Principal	1
Assistant Principals	3
N. E. Coordinator	1
Curriculum Consultant	1
	8

4. Native language:

All 26 participants indicated English.

5. Highest degree earned, with year:

	English	Education	Foreign Language	Other
Bachelor's	2	1	1	6
Master's		8		2
Bachelor's and Certificate		1		
Master's and Certificate		3		

No degree: 1

Primary certificate only: 1

1960-4	7
1955-9	7
1950-4	6
1945-9	1
1940-4	
1935-9	
1930-4	3
No degree	1
[no response	1]

6. Foreign language(s) studied, and number of years:

No. of Languages	No. of Participants
0	1
1	9
2	10
3	5
4	1

Total No. of Years	No. of Participants
0	1
1	2
2	4
3	4
4	0
5	2
6	5
7 or more	8

Languages Named	No. of Participants
French	17
Latin	12
Spanish	9
German	7
Italian	2
Russian	1

7. Prior academic training in the teaching of English to non-English speakers:

Yes: 12 [Workshops and university courses being the most commonly named]

No: 14

PART II

1. Number of years of teaching, indicating level(s):

Levels	No. of Participants
Elementary only	10
Elementary and secondary	2
Secondary only	1
Elementary, secondary, and college/Univ.	1
Secondary and college/Univ.	1
Adult education, etc.	1
Elementary and adult	5
Elementary, secondary, adult	2
Secondary and Adult	2
[No response	1]

No. of Years	No. of Participants
30-34	2
25-29	0
20-24	3
15-19	5
10-14	4
5-9	6
0-4	5
[No response	1]

2. Levels of instruction in English to non-English-speaking students during the past three years:

Levels	No. of Participants
1 - 3	6
4 - 6	5
1 - 6	3
7 - 9	4
1 - 9	1
10 - 12	1
Other	1

[The remaining 5 participants either did not respond or indicated that the question did not apply because they were administrators rather than teachers.]

3. Situation in which English was taught to non-English-speaking students during the past three years:

Situation	No. of Participants
Classes had some non-English speakers	12 [1 also tutored]
Classes had only non-English speakers	3
Experience with both of the foregoing	3 [1 also tutored]
Experience with tutoring and with classes entirely of non-English speakers	3
[No response, or indication that the question did not apply because participants were administrators]	[5]

4. Was one foreign language dominant among the non-English-speaking students during the past year?

Dominant Language	No. of Participants
Spanish	23
Spanish & Italian	1
Russian	1
[No response	1]

5. Number of classes containing non-English-speaking students last year, and total size of each such class:

Responses to this item varied so greatly that meaningful generalizations appear impossible. Teachers reported having from 1 to 5 classes. Most of these classes had between 25 and 35 students, the median being about 31. No generalization can be made about the percent of non-English-speaking students in classes which also contained native speakers of English, for there appeared to be no typical situation in this regard.

6. Number of hours per week each such class met:

Again, the variety of responses was too great to allow for meaningful generalizations. Responses ranged from 1 to 30 hours, the most commonly given being 2, 5, and 25.

7. Length in months of 1963-4 class(es) containing non-English-speaking students:

Almost all the participants who answered this question indicated 9-10 months.

8. Amount of class time allotted to exclusive instruction of the non-English speakers:

Hours	No. of Participants
less than 1	3
1 - 2	6
3 or more	10
[No response:	7]

9. Use of texts designed particularly for non-English-speaking students:

22 participants responded to this question, though 4 reported that no special materials were used. Three participants reported preparing their own materials. Of the texts named, the following appeared at least two times:

N.Y.C. Guides, "Teaching English to Puerto Rican Children" [8]

Fries, "American English Series" [3]

Dixson readers [2]

PART III

1. Probable value of the Institute activities (using the scale 5: should be very useful; 4: should be rather useful; 3: should be of some use; 2: probably will not be of much use; 1: probably will not be of any use):

	Ratings						
Activities	5	4	3	2	1	Omit	Mean
Linguistics	5	4	10	6	1		3.23
Methodology	9	7	9	1	0		3.92
Observation	8	4	11	1	2		3.58
Anthropology	17	5	2	1	0	1	4.52
Spanish [illegible]	18	3	4	1	0		4.46

2. Evaluation of various aspects of the Institute (using the scale 5: excellent; 4: good; 3: satisfactory; 2: only fair; 1: unsatisfactory):*

	Ratings					
Aspects	5	4	3	2	1	Mean
Scheduling of Activities	2	5	6	7	5	2.68
Integration of Activities	5	8	6	4	2	3.40
Level of Instruction	5	10	9	1	0	3.76
Planning	9	6	4	4	2	3.64

3. Criticisms of the 1964 Institute and suggestions for future Institutes:

Twenty participants offered recommendations and criticisms. In compiling the following list, we have included all suggestions and comments made by over two participants.

1) The schedule was too full, allowing too little leisure and study time. 18

2) More opportunities should be provided for participants to learn at first-hand about the Puerto Rican culture (as by having more excursions and field trips). 14

*Page 4 from one questionnaire was missing; hence N = 25.

3) The instruction in linguistics was pitched at too high a level and should have been more practical. 7

4) There should have been more opportunities for interaction between the two groups - on an informal basis. 7

5) More instruction in Spanish should be provided. 6

6) More careful planning is needed. 6

7) Participants should not be required to eat together. 3

Appendix III

ANALYSIS OF RETURNS FROM THE SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTICIPANTS IN THE NDEA ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTES 1964

David P. Harris

U.C.L.A. Institute

Questionnaires returned by 46 participants (out of 55).

1. Indicate how useful you are now finding what you learned in the following institute classes. (Please use the scale 5 = very useful, 4 = rather useful, 3 = of some use, 2 = not of much use, 1 = not of any use.) (46 responses)

NOTE: In the First Questionnaire, completed by the participants during the last week of the institute, respondents were asked to anticipate the probable value to them of the program activities, using the same scale as given above. The earlier ratings of the participants who responded to the Follow-up Questionnaire are shown here for comparison purposes. The figures given for the First Survey are, therefore, based on only part of the original sample. However, the means shown here for the selected sample are consistently within .3 of a rating point of the means obtained from the complete sample, as may be seen by referring to Appendix II.

Activities	Ratings						
	5	4	3	2	1	Omit	Mean
Linguistics							
First Questionnaire	24	4	11	5	1	1	4.00
Follow-up Questionnaire	23	11	9	1	1	1	4.20
Methodology							
First Questionnaire	26	11	5	4			4.28
Follow-up Questionnaire	22	10	8	4	1	1	4.07
Demonstration							
First Questionnaire	12	9	13	6	6		3.33
Follow-up Questionnaire	12	5	19	8	1	1	3.42
Anthropology							
First Questionnaire	8	7	11	12	6	2	2.98
Follow-up Questionnaire	9	6	21	6	3	1	3.27
Spanish (or English)							
First Questionnaire	14	10	8	7	3	4	3.60
Follow-up Questionnaire	15	17	7	4	1	2	3.93
Practice Teaching							
Follow-up Questionnaire only	6	4	13	12	9	2	2.68

2. As a result of your training in the summer institute, what changes have you made in your classes as regards the following:

   a. Choice of textbooks and other teaching materials (37 responses)

   No change: 6
   - 2 are allowed no choice.
   - 1 was already using institute materials.

   No change yet: 6
   - all 6 have requested new texts.

   Have made changes: 25
   - 13 have changed or supplemented their texts.
   - 5 have prepared new materials.
   - 4 have prepared or acquired new tapes.
   - 2 have ordered audio-visual aids.
   - 1 has expanded her bibliography.

   b. Classroom techniques (40 responses)

   Little or no change: 5

   Have made changes: 35
   - 33 are making greater use of the linguistic approach.
   - 1 has a greater understanding of familiar techniques.
   - 1 devotes more time to reading.

   c. Time devoted to non-English speakers (36 responses)

   No change: 5

   More time: 9

   NOTE: 22 tell how much time they devote to non-English speakers rather than how the time they devote has been changed as a result of the institute.

   d. Student grouping (33 responses)

   No change: 8
   - 3 find existing grouping adequate.

   Have made changes: 7

   NOTE: 18 tell how they group rather than how their grouping has been changed as a result of the institute.

3. What regulations or restrictions, if any, would prevent you from making additional changes in the above? (32 responses)

   None: 20
   Restrictions on texts: 3
   Budget restrictions: 3
   Unawareness on the part of administration of ESL instruction: 3
   Crowded conditions: 2
   Need for revised adult education texts in ESL: 1

4. Have you been asked to speak about what you learned at the institute or to act as a consultant in any ESL or related activities? (44 responses)

   Yes: 30 No: 14

5. Is there any current expansion of ESL activities in your school? (41 responses)

   a. Teachers and School Principals (25 responses in this category)

      Yes: 11 No: 14

      Is it in any way a result of your attendance at the institute?

      Yes: 8 No: 3

   b. Supervisors, Language Coordinators, and Consultants (16 responses in this category)

      Yes: 16

      Is it in any way a result of your attendance at the institute?

      Yes: 12 No: 4

6. If you felt that the schedule for the 1964 institute program was too full, in what specific ways would you recommend that it be lightened? (44 responses)

   Eliminate or reduce the evening film and lecture schedule or incorporate it in the day schedule: 18
   Cut demonstration classes by 1/2 or more: 12
   Make anthropology optional or condense it to 2-3 classes a week: 8
   Eliminate testing for grades: 5
   Reduce the amount of work required for linguistics or divide the group into beginners and intermediate/advanced: 5
   Cut down the amount of required reading: 3

7. Are there any kinds of instruction which you would like to see added to or given more emphasis in future English institutes? (42 responses)

   No: 3
   Greater emphasis on practical application:13 (especially in linguistics: 7)
   Anthropology approach should be multicultural and/or related to language teaching: 7
   A course in elementary linguistics: 4
   More time devoted to lesson and materials preparation: 5
   More time devoted to linguistics: 3
   More emphasis on methods: 3
   Include a course in psychology of language learning: 2

8. Would you recommend these institutes to others? (43 responses)

   Yes: 33 Qualified yes: 6

   No: 4 (mostly those who felt too little of practical value was gained from the institute)

Puerto Rican Institute

I. Puerto Rican Teachers

Questionnaires returned by 23 participants (out of 27).

1. Indicate how useful you are now finding what you learned in the following institute classes. (Please use the scale 5 = very useful, 4 = rather useful, 3 = of some use, 2 = not of much use, 1 = not of any use.) (23 responses)

   NOTE: See question 1 in the U.C.L.A. section for the note, which is also applicable here.

Activities	Ratings						
	5	4	3	2	1	Omit	Mean
Linguistics							
First Questionnaire	10	5	7	1			4.04
Follow-up Questionnaire	11	7	4	1			4.22
Methodology							
First Questionnaire	21	1	1				4.87
Follow-up Questionnaire	17	4	2				4.65
Demonstration							
First Questionnaire	20	2		1			4.78
Follow-up Questionnaire	14	5	3	1			4.39
Anthropology							
First Questionnaire	10	9	4				4.26
Follow-up Questionnaire	7	6	10				3.87
Spanish (or English)							
First Questionnaire	22	1					4.96
Follow-up Questionnaire	19	3	1				4.78
Practice Teaching							
Follow-up Questionnaire only	10	5	5	1		2	4.14

2. As a result of your training in the summer institute, what changes have you made in your classes as regards the following:

a. Choice of textbooks and other teaching materials (17 responses)

No change: 9
- 7 are restricted by board of education lists, teachers guides, etc.
- 2 teach second grade and use no textbooks.

Have made changes: 8
- 5 have chosen more suitable textbooks.
- 2 have added student activities, for example, a reading club, to develop skills.
- 1 has developed audio-visual aids and has better equipment.

b. Classroom techniques (19 responses)

No change: 3
- 1 noted that she already uses institute techniques.

Have made changes: 16
- 11 are making greater use of the linguistic approach.
- 3 are making better use of familiar techniques.
- 2 are placing greater emphasis on reading.

c. Time devoted to non-English speakers (19 responses)

No change: 4
- all 4 have their schedule established by the Board of Education or their schools.

Devote more time: 2
- 1 specifies that more time is given to slow groups.

NOTE: 13 tell how much time they devote to non-English speakers rather than how the time they devote has changed as a result of the institute.

d. Student grouping (17 responses)

No change: 7
- 2 note that their school establishes grouping.
- 2 do not have enough time.

Have made changes: 4

NOTE: 6 tell how they group rather than how their grouping has been changed as a result of their institute training.

3. What local regulations or restrictions, if any, would prevent you from making additional changes in the above? (20 responses)

None: 14
Inadequate time allotment: 3
Classroom shortage, program entirely planned by supervisor, textbooks and teacher guides prescribed by the department of education: 1 each

4. Have you been asked to speak about what you learned at the institute or to act as a consultant in any ESL or related activities? (23 responses)

   Yes: 10 No: 13

5. Is there any current expansion of ESL activities in your school? (15 responses)

   a. Teachers and School Principals (16 respondents in this category)

      Yes: 6 No: 10

      Is it in any way a result of your attendance at the institute?

      Yes: 5

   b. Supervisors, Language Coordinators, and Consultants (No respondents in this category)

6. If you felt that the schedule for the 1964 institute program was too full, in what specific ways would you recommend that it be lightened? (21 responses)

   Not too full: 8
   Fewer after-class lectures: 4
   Lengthen institute to full semester: 2
   No Saturday classes: 2
   Cut demonstration and methods from 2 hours to 90 minutes, eliminate linguistics course, offer fewer subjects, discontinue activity period, cut assignments down, allow more time for lunch: 1 each

7. Are there any kinds of instruction which you would like to see added to or given more emphasis in future English institutes? (20 responses)

   No: 1
   More emphasis on methods: 12
   More language study: 6
   More linguistics: 2
   More mixing of Mainlanders and Puerto Ricans, more social activities: 2

8. Would you recommend these institutes to others? (22 responses)

   Yes: 22

Puerto Rican Institute

II. Mainland Teachers

Questionnaires returned by 16 participants (out of 26).

1. Indicate how useful you are now finding what you learned in the following institute classes. (Please use the scale 5 = very useful, 4 = rather useful, 3 = of some use, 2 = not of much use, 1 = not of any use.) (16 responses)

   NOTE: See question 1 in the U.C.L.A. section for the note, which is also applicable here.

Activities	Ratings						
	5	4	3	2	1	Omit	Mean
Linguistics							
First Questionnaire	3	3	6	3	1		3.25
Follow-up Questionnaire	2	4	6	1	3		3.06
Methodology							
First Questionnaire	4	5	7				3.81
Follow-up Questionnaire	5	7	3	1			4.00
Demonstration							
First Questionnaire	4	2	9		1		3.50
Follow-up Questionnaire	2	5	7	2			3.44
Anthropology							
First Questionnaire	12	2	1				4.73
Follow-up Questionnaire	9	4	2	1			4.31
Spanish (or English)							
First Questionnaire	11	2	3				4.50
Follow-up Questionnaire	13	2	1				4.75
Follow-up Questionnaire only	3	4	4	2	1	2	3.43

2. As a result of your training in the summer institute, what changes have you made in your classes as regards the following:

   a. Choice of textbooks and other teaching materials (16 responses)

   No change: 8
   - 4 are restricted to board of education lists.
   - 2 find present materials satisfactory.

   Have made changes: 8
   - 4 have added supplemental or teacher-made materials.
   - 3 are using new texts (1-Fries, 1-Laidlow Spanish readers)

   b. Classroom techniques (16 responses)

   No changes: 1

   Have made changes: 15
   - 7 make more use of the linguistic approach.
   - 3 have greater understanding of familiar techniques.

   c. Time devoted to non-English speakers (15 responses)

   No change: 4
   - all 4 note that programs were in existence and have not been modified.

   Less time: 2

   More time: 1
   - twice as much time is spent reading.

   NOTE: 6 of the other 8 respondents tell how much time they devote to non-English speakers rather than how the time they devote has changed as a result of their institute training.

   d. Student grouping (13 responses)

   No change: 7
   - 4 use already established grouping.

   Have made changes: 4
   - 1 each: classes have been reorganized for English instruction; increased teaming of children at different levels; emphasis on grouping according to former schooling; new classes based wholly on institute training.

   NOTE: 2 tell how they group rather than how their grouping has been modified as a result of their institute training.

3. What local regulations or restrictions, if any, would prevent you from making additional changes in the above? (11 responses)

   None: 8
   Restrictions on texts: 2
   Overcrowding and lack of special teachers: 1

4. Have you been asked to speak about what you learned at the institute or to act as a consultant in any ESL or related activities? (16 responses)

   Yes: 9 No: 7

5. Is there any current expansion of ESL activities in your school? (16 responses)

   a. Teachers and School Principals (14 responses in this category)

      Yes: 4 No: 10

      Is it in any way a result of your attendance at the institute?

      Yes: 4

   b. Supervisors, Language Coordinators, and Consultants (2 responses in this category)

      Yes: 2

      Is it in any way a result of your attendance at the institute?

      No responses

6. If you felt that the schedule for the 1964 institute program was too full, in what specific ways would you recommend that it be lightened? (15 responses)

   Reduce the number of guest speakers or incorporate them in the 7:30-3:30 class day: 6
   Have no Saturday classes: 5
   Less emphasis on, or a different approach to, linguistics: 4
   Less emphasis on methods: 3

7. Are there any kinds of instruction which you would like to see added to or given more emphasis in future English institutes? (14 responses)

   Spanish for non-Spanish speakers: 7
   Applied linguistics: 3
   Demonstration classes with a single student group rather than three: 3
   Culture: 2
   Exposure to Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans: 2 (another 7 mentioned this under question 6)
   A workshop for secondary methods and demonstration, a joint Puerto Rican-Mainlander seminar on methods: 1 each

8. Would you recommend these institutes to others? (16 responses)

   Yes: 15 No: 1